

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Jerod J. Cook,)	C/A No. 5:12-cv-2608-RMG-KDW
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
)	
v.)	
)	
)	
Warden Wayne C McCabe, Lt Darryl)	ORDER
McGhee, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendants filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on January 18, 2013. ECF No. 27. As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order on January 22, 2013, pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising Plaintiff of the importance of a motion for summary judgment and of the need for him to file an adequate response. ECF No. 28. Plaintiff was informed that his response was due by February 25, 2013, and was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, Defendants' motion may be granted, thereby ending his case.

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's *Roseboro* order, Plaintiff has failed to respond to the motion. As such, it appears to the court that Plaintiff does not oppose the motion and wishes to abandon his action against Defendants. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is directed to advise the court whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment by **March 18, 2013**. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, this

action against Defendants will be recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.



February 28, 2013
Florence, South Carolina

Kaymani D. West
United States Magistrate Judge